

### **Appendix 1 –Chronology – Southwest Landfill EA Process**

This chronology lists the date, title and description of key documents, along with any key comments provided by the Medical Officer of Health (“MOH”) at the time, Dr. Douglas Neal and comments by the JMCC or PRT.

<b>January 9, 2013</b>	<b>MOU between Municipalities and WEG</b>
<b>Description</b>	This memorandum of understanding formed the basis of the JMCC. It stipulates that the JMCC will be funded by WEG. The purpose of the JMCC is to implement an independent multidisciplinary peer review of the EA process through the PRT. The JMCC will also report its findings, conclusions and recommendations to the Municipalities and to WEG. The JMCC has the power to enter onto the subject lands with notice to WEG.

<b>May 9, 2013</b>	<b>Draft Terms of Reference</b>
<b>Description</b>	The draft Terms of Reference receive comments from stakeholders before being submitted to the Ministry of the Environment for review and approval.
<b>PRT Comments</b>	<p>The PRT provided a report on the draft TOR on July 5, 2013 with the following key findings and recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The draft TOR contained insufficient information to support this site. WEG should provide more detailed information regarding alternative sites for the landfill and how this site was chosen and should identify ancillary facilities that may be associated with the landfill so that their impacts can be considered</li> <li>2. WEG should provide detailed, discipline specific work plans, a baseline report, and a more detailed description of the undertaking for all disciplines.</li> <li>3. WEG should provide further details regarding the relationship between WEG and Carmeuse Lime for impact assessments.</li> <li>4. WEG should consider groundwater and surface water treatment alternatives in the alternative methods assessment.</li> <li>5. WEG should correct incorrect criteria references.</li> <li>6. The TOR should reflect a more interdisciplinary approach.</li> <li>7. WEG should fully incorporate public comments into the assessment criteria.</li> <li>8. TOR should consider cumulative effects.</li> <li>9. TOR should require reporting of monitoring results.</li> <li>10. TOR should include a human health risk assessment.</li> <li>11. TOR should include a detailed consultation plan.</li> </ol>
<b>MOH Comments</b>	- In a May 24, 2013 letter, requested that WEG include a Health Impact Assessment as part of the TOR to ensure a study of the cumulative impacts to human health.

<b>May 24, 2013</b>	<b>Letter from MOH to WEG</b>
<b>Description</b>	This letter requested that WEG “include a Health Impact Assessment as part of the Southwestern Landfill Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference”.

<b>Aug 29, 2013</b>	<b>Revised Draft Terms of Reference</b>
<b>Description</b>	WEG revised its TOR and submitted these TOR to the Ministry of Environment after integrating most of the JMCC’s recommendations. The public and the JMCC had 60 days to review these revised TOR and provide further comments on the revised TOR.
<b>PRT Comments</b>	<p>The PRT provided a report on October 8, 2013 with five key findings and associated recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. WEG should provide for technical consultations in advance of alternative methods evaluation in order to address: the appropriate level of detail in this evaluation; databases and monitoring programs used for this assessment; criteria used to evaluate air quality, odour, noise and vibration and how these metrics will be measured considering the Carmeuse quarry operations; how to integrate net effects for aquatic, terrestrial, surface and groundwater into the ecological effects assessment; how to integrate net effects related to socioeconomic effects assessment; and methodology for human health risk assessment.</li> <li>2. Include reference to basic ancillary facilities such as recycling and composting.</li> <li>3. WEG should address net impacts on gross economic output, vibration of trucks on haul routes, and visual impacts from construction, operation and landfill gas activities.</li> <li>4. Key recommendations from the report regarding: the agricultural work plan; haul routes; health care facilities costs, the terrestrial ecology work plan; concerns about litter, vermin, traffic, water contamination should be cross referenced between multiple work plans; cultural heritage resource assessment and collecting baseline data for the human health risk assessment work plan.</li> <li>5. Overall that WEG review and address specific recommendations in the PRT report</li> </ol>
<b>MOH Comments</b>	- Notably, WEG added a Human Health Risk Assessment expert to its technical team and edited its work plan in consultation with the MOH.

<b>January 2014</b>	<b>Decision Extension</b>
<b>Description</b>	<p>In January, WEG requested additional time to review and consider comments received, respond to these comments, and amend its TOR to incorporate the input received during the consultation period.</p> <p>The JMCC expressed concerns with this request outlined in a letter dated January 28, 2014, requesting clearer communication from WEG and increased transparency. The Ministry granted WEG's request for additional time to amend its TOR.</p>

<b>May 2, 2014</b>	<b>Letter from Haussmann Consulting to JMCC</b>
<b>Description</b>	<p>This letter addressed an amendment issued April 2, 2014 to the draft terms of reference by WEG. In this amendment WEG agreed to a number of changes suggested by the JMCC including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consulting PRT on evaluation methodology for alternative methods;</li> <li>• Consulting PRT in developing workplans;</li> <li>• Providing for PRT observation of field work;</li> <li>• Enhanced groundwater and surface water assessment;</li> <li>• Addressing requirements of Aggregate Resources Act and Endangered Species Act;</li> <li>• Working with MTO to assess transportation;</li> <li>• Conducting a screening level review of the socio-economic effects assessment to identify any potential health effects requiring additional mitigation measures; and</li> <li>• Document and support the carcinogenic and non-carcinogenic toxicological reference values used in the Health Risk Assessment.</li> </ul> <p>The PRT recommended that as a condition of approval of the TOR, WEG be required to identify ancillary facilities that may be associated with the undertaking and are likely to be developed at this site, and to conduct a cumulative effects assessment of all such identified facilities. Further the PRT recommended specific areas in which it would like to be consulted with respect to the development of the work plans.</p>

<b>March 17, 2016</b>	<b>Approval of Terms of Reference</b>
<b>Description</b>	<p>MOECC (as it then was) accepted the TOR, allowing WEG to conduct the EA. This involves WEG undertaking studies and completing technical work plans to draft an EA and to determine if the proposed landfill can be constructed and operated safely.</p>

<b>March 18, 2016</b>	<b>Letter from JMCC to WEG re TOR</b>
<b>Description</b>	The day following MOECC's approval of the TOR, Margaret Lupton, chair of the JMCC and Mayor of Zorra Township issued a formal statement expressing disappointment with the MOECC's decision to approve the TOR.
<b>April 19, 2016</b>	<b>Meeting between WEG and the JMCC</b>
<b>Description</b>	WEG met with the JMCC to review and discuss the Minister's decision to approve its TOR and WEG's intent to proceed to the EA phase. WEG committed to providing the JMCC with milestones at which the JMCC would have opportunities to review the EA work products.
<b>May 23, 2016</b>	<b>Letter from JMCC to WEG</b>
<b>Description</b>	<p>The PRT peer reviewed WEG's Draft Environmental Assessment Updated Work Plans. The JMCC requested that WEG address the recommendations in the PRT report and specifically set up technical meetings with the PRT, MOECC and other stakeholders to resolve Air and Noise work plan issues; groundwater and surface water work plan issues; and a meeting with the MOH to address health risks and effects from the socio-economic effects assessment.</p> <p>In response to this request, WEG held the stated multi-agency meetings and addressed outstanding comments related to the groundwater, surface water, air, noise and health work plans in a manner deemed satisfactory by the PRT.</p>
<b>August 2, 2016</b>	<b>JMCC Letter to WEG re Approach to PRT Review</b>
<b>Description</b>	<p>The JMCC requested a more comprehensive review of the following documents, with the ability to prepare budgets based on its best judgment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The preferred alternative methods report;</li> <li>• The draft technical work plans prior to commencement of studies;</li> <li>• The draft baseline conditions reports; and</li> <li>• The draft EA.</li> </ul>
<b>WEG Response</b>	WEG responded on August 24, 2016 indicating that it agreed to fund an expanded scope of review to address the concerns raised by the JMCC. WEG did not agree to fund a peer review of the draft baseline conditions report separately as proposed by the PRT and JMCC; instead indicating that the baseline conditions report would be available for peer review as part of the PRT's review of the Draft EA.

<b>Jan 3, 2017</b>	<b>Alternative Methods Interim Report</b>
<b>Description</b>	The Alternative Methods Interim Report was produced by WEG pursuant to the TOR.
<b>PRT Comments</b>	<p>Provided comments on March 10, 2017</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- WEG should adequately compare the impacts on groundwater serving as a municipal water supply in two scenarios: first, where the landfill proceeds and second, where the landfill does not proceed and the quarrying continues.</li> </ul>

<b>February and March, 2017</b>	<b>Review of Updated Work Plans</b>
<b>Description</b>	WEG issued updated work plans to the PRT for review in February and March of 2017. Upon receipt, the PRT reviewed the work plans and provided recommendations to WEG for amendments.

<b>March 2017</b>	<b>Human Health Risk Assessment (“HHRA”) and Supplementary Health Review Work Plan</b>
<b>Description</b>	In March of 2017 WEG provided the JMCC with a HHRA and Supplementary Health Review Work Plan. This document was prepared to address the human health risk assessment component of the EA.
<b>PRT Comments</b>	<p>Comments provided via a report done by NovaTox May 2, 2017. In general, NovaTox found the HHRA Work Plan to be sufficient.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Majority of comments and recommendations for the original 2015 HHRA Work Plan have been accepted and agreed upon by WEG but are not yet in this document as of March 2017.</li> <li>- Chemicals of potential concern should be included in the HHRA workplan.</li> <li>- Reference should also be made to future conditions and chemicals of potential concern.</li> <li>- Should include summary of how the chemicals of potential concern for air and groundwater and surface water quality will be selected for inclusion within the HHRA.</li> <li>- Operational and post-closure conditions should be considered assuming leakage.</li> <li>- Suggested alternative wordings to increase clarity</li> <li>- Provincial policy should be given priority over federal policy. Other jurisdictions should only be considered if there is a gap in provincial or federal policy.</li> </ul>
<b>MOH Comments</b>	There is potential for health-related effects extending beyond those addressed through the HHRA such as indirect health impacts stemming from the social and economic impacts of the proposed landfill and a supplementary health review was requested.

<b>March 20, 2017</b>	<b>Letter from JMCC to WEG re Alternative Methods Interim Report</b>
<b>Description</b>	The JMCC sent a letter to WEG outlining that the PRT review of the Alternative Methods Interim Report identified significant deficiencies, and failed to analyze a number of important disciplines. The JMCC indicated disappointment that WEG refused to fund a full multidisciplinary review of its assessment of alternative methods. WEG accepted some but not all of the PRT's recommended changes to this document.

<b>May 23, 2017</b>	<b>JMCC Letter to WEG re Outstanding Issues</b>
<b>Description</b>	The JMCC requested a meeting with WEG to address four outstanding issues relating to funding shortfalls: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. WEG has not agreed to fund a comprehensive peer review of the alternative methods report.</li> <li>2. WEG should fund a peer review of the baseline conditions reports.</li> <li>3. WEG should fund the peer review of the draft land use forecast released by WEG in April 2017.</li> <li>4. How to address future legal fees.</li> </ol>

<b>September, 2017</b>	<b>Letter from MOH/JMCC to WEG</b>
<b>Description</b>	The JMCC sent a letter to WEG attaching a letter from the MOH.
<b>MOH Letter</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Requests a meeting between the JMCC, WEG and Public Health to review the Work Plans.</li> <li>- <b>Questions to be addressed include:</b></li> <li>- Evidence of long-term effectiveness, durability and mitigation in case of failure of the liner system</li> <li>- How to address leachate disposal</li> <li>- Concerns regarding air quality and gases produced by the landfill</li> <li>- Socio-psychological effects of imposing a landfill on a community that does not want it and will derive little benefit from it</li> <li>- Cumulative Effects Assessment was conducted with insufficient interdisciplinary analysis</li> <li>- Impacts on air, noise, water and traffic are relevant to human health and should be included in the Supplementary Health Review Work Plan.</li> </ul>
<b>JMCC Letter</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- JMCC endorses MOH's request for a meeting with WEG to discuss concerns with the HHRA work plan.</li> </ul>

<b>Nov 28, 2017</b>	<b>HHRA Final Work Plan Meeting Notes</b>
<b>Description</b>	This meeting was intended to discuss the content of the HHRA Work Plan with stakeholders including consultants, the JMCC, the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change and Oxford County MOH. This process resulted in WEG making some but not all of the recommended changes to these workplans as proposed by the PRT and MOH.

<b>PRT Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Climate change brings more water and greater variability in weather, which may impact the landfill engineering.</li> <li>- It would be helpful to have a description of what upset conditions (as opposed to normal operating conditions) are anticipated and what contingency plans would be in place (at a high level).</li> <li>- Questioned whether the most stringent standard will be used if there are multiple applicable standards. WEG answered that it depends on recommendations from their toxicologists who will provide a rationale.</li> </ul>
<b>MOH Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The community is sensitive to water-related topics. Expressed concern that the landfill liner might fail</li> <li>- Expressed concern that hydrogeological models may not be able to account for contingencies in a vulnerable quarry setting</li> <li>- WEG should consider the impacts of the changing climate on its landfill</li> </ul>

<b>February, 2018</b>	<b>Land Use Planning Forecast</b>
<b>Description</b>	JMCC/PRT provided peer review comments on the WEG draft Land Use Planning Forecast (WEG, October 2017), a key document to be used during the EA study process as the basis for the study of land use impacts of the landfill proposal and its alternatives. WEG provided responses to these comments. The PRT peer reviewer then provided a summary response indicating areas where WEG had not addressed PRT comments or concerns in December 2018. WEG chose to agree to some but not all of the PRT comments and recommendations provided with respect to this document.

<b>April 13, 2018</b>	<b>Chris Haussmann Email to WEG re Work Plans</b>
<b>Description</b>	<p>Chris Haussmann emailed WEG regarding the final EA technical work plans with the following key comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The PRT's comments regarding the archaeology work plan were not given proper consideration, including: stating that stage 3 assessments must be done prior to construction if recommended by stages 1 or 2 assessments; draft development plans should be given to the archaeological consultant prior to stage 1 assessment; insufficient engagement with indigenous communities; and the need for a follow-up archaeological Risk Management Plan.</li> <li>• Inconsistencies in the economics work plan.</li> <li>• Inconsistencies in what is included in the study area for the visual work plan.</li> </ul>

<b>May 2, 2018</b>	<b>ARA Memo forwarded to PRT by WEG</b>
<b>Description</b>	Memorandum from WEG Archaeological consultant responds satisfactorily to PRT comments on archaeology workplan.

<b>January 2019</b>	<b>WEG Interview Requests</b>
<b>Description</b>	<p>WEG sent a series of letters to the Municipalities to request interviews with staff and elected officials as part of its social and economic impact assessments. The Municipalities responded by asking for a written list of questions, which WEG provided.</p> <p>The Municipalities provided responses to the written questions, but noted that they would not direct questions to elected officials, who only speak through resolutions and by-laws.</p>

<b>April 25, 2019</b>	<b>JMCC Letter to WEG re PRT Process</b>
<b>Description</b>	<p>The JMCC provided WEG with a detailed table of its review process of the draft EA and associate timeline for this review. A modified version is attached to this memo as Appendix 2.</p>

<b>August 21, 2019</b>	<b>WEG Letter to JMCC re PRT Process</b>
<b>Description</b>	<p>WEG generally agreed to the timeline for reviewing the pre-submission draft EA but proposed the following reduced timelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PRT budget preparation from 30 to 15 days;</li> <li>• Draft EA Review from 90 to 45-60 days; and,</li> <li>• JMCC finalization of final PRT report from 90 days to 30 days.</li> </ul> <p>While the PRT estimated 150 days for total review, WEG is proposing 105 days.</p>

<b>September 13, 2019</b>	<b>JMCC Letter to WEG re PRT Process</b>
<b>Description</b>	<p>The JMCC responded to WEG's letter to indicate that the time estimates provided April 25, 2019 remain the best estimates and that the JMCC has no basis for agreeing to a shorter timeframe.</p>
<b>MOH</b>	<p>The MOH also responded to this letter on September 18, 2019 to confirm the timeframe proposed by the JMCC and to indicate that it would be working with Public Health Ontario and the PRT to review the draft EA.</p>